



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/214,645 09/27/99 SHORT

J 09010/046001

EXAMINER

SISSON, B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1655

DATE MAILED:

01/22/01

LISA A. HAILE PH.D.
GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
4365 EXECUTIVE DRIVE
SUITE 1600
SAN DIEGO CA 92121

HM22/0122

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/214,645

Applicant(s)

SHORT, JAY M.

Examiner

Bradley L. Sisson

Art Unit

1655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Bracketing or underlining are commonly used to indicate amendments or changes in the claims as provided in 37 CFR 1.121(a)(2)(ii) and are normally not intended to be printed in the published patent. In the reply filed 30 October 2000, applicant has used brackets to denote text to be deleted and underlining to represent text added to claim 3 in such a manner that it is unclear to the examiner whether in each and every instance the text encompassed by brackets is intended to appear in the patent. The use of brackets renders the interpretation of the amendment unclear because the claim uses brackets in the name of various chemicals. If underlining and/or bracketing is intended to appear in the claims in the published patent, such intention must be clearly indicated in applicant's reply to this notice. It is suggested that claim 3 be canceled and a new claim, with brackets and underlining intended for publishing, be added.

Drawings

2. The drawings remain objected to for reasons of record; see the PTO-948 that was attached to Paper No. 7. Acknowledgement is made of applicant's willingness to file corrected drawings upon notification of allowable subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101/112

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible and substantial asserted utility or a well-established utility.

The method of claims 1 and 9 is directed to the generation of mutated polynucleotides in a recombinant cell system which comprises the interruption or blocking of polynucleotide synthesis by any number of possible routes. The claimed method places no limitation on the type or types of mutated polynucleotides nor is there any assurance that the mutated polynucleotide(s) are involved in the coding or regulation of any gene, much less a gene that has been found to be useful, and lesser still that the mutation will in and of its self result in any useful product

Claims 1 and 9 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a credible and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

6. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Art Unit: 1655

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988). They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

The Quantity of Experimentation Necessary

The quantity of experimentation is on the order of several man-years with little if any reasonable expectation of success.

The Amount of Direction or Guidance Provided

The amount of guidance is extremely limited.

The Presence or Absence of Working Examples

The specification provides but 4 prophetic examples:

- Example 1, page 64, Generation of Random Size Polynucleotides Using U.V. Induced Photoproducts.
- Example 2, pages 64, Isolation of Random Size Polynucleotides.
- Example 3, page 65, Shuffling of Isolated Random Size 100-300 bp Polynucleotides.
- Example 4, page 65, Screening of Polypeptides from Shuffled Polypeptides.

The Nature of the Invention

The claimed invention relates directly to matters of physiology and chemistry, which are inherently unpredictable and as such, require greater levels of enablement. As noted in *In re Fisher* 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA, 1970):

In cases involving predictable factors, such as that, once imagined, other embodiments can be made without difficulty and their performance characteristics predicted by resort to known scientific laws. In cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved.

The State of the Prior Art

The area of art to which the invention belongs is undeveloped and quite unpredictable. To complicate matters, the claimed method does not involve any method steps that would screen for otherwise target the amplification interruption/mutagenizing means to a polypeptide having a desired property. Rather, the method seemingly has one to target entire cells or genomic libraries.

Upon review of the specification it is seen that one does not target entire cells but rather works with isolated polynucleotides. Even using the prophetic examples for guidance leaves the skilled artisan wanting for further guidance to practice the claimed invention as the specification is essentially silent as to just how one intuitively selects for a polypeptide with a "desired property." The specification is equally forthcoming in providing some guidance as to the probability of finding useful mutated polypeptides so as to establish some frame work within which one of skill in the art can gauge their relative success or lack thereof. While the specification does provide many suggestions as to how the problems of the subject invention may be approached, it is essentially left up to the public to resolve the operational conditions so to

Art Unit: 1655

fully enable the claimed invention. The situation at hand is analogous to that in *Genentech v.*

Novo Nordisk A/S 42 USPQ2d 1001. As set forth in the decision of the Court:

“‘[T]o be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.’ *In re Wright* 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *see also Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharms. Co.*, 927 F. 2d 1200, 1212, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1026 (Fed Cir. 1991); *In re Fisher*, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) (‘[T]he scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art.’). ”

“Patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable. *See Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 536, 148 USPQ 689, 696 (1966) (starting, in context of the utility requirement, that ‘a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion.’) Tossing out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure. While every aspect of a generic claim certainly need not have been carried out by an inventor, or exemplified in the specification, reasonable detail must be provided in order to enable members of the public to understand and carry out the invention.

“It is true . . . that a specification need not disclose what is well known in the art. *See, e.g., Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1385, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986). However, that general, oft-repeated statement is merely a rule of supplementation, not a substitute for a basic enabling disclosure. It means that the omission of minor details does not cause a specification to fail to meet the enablement requirement. However, when there is no disclosure of any specific starting material or any of the conditions under which a process can be carried out, undue experimentation is required; there is a failure to meet the enablement requirement that cannot be rectified by asserting that all the disclosure related to the process is within the skill of the art. It is the specification, not the knowledge of one skill in the art, that must supply the novel aspects of an invention in order to constitute adequate enablement. This specification provides only a starting point, a direction for further research.

The Relative Skill of Those in the Art

The relative skill of those in the art that is most closely associated with the claimed invention is high, on par with those that hold a Ph.D. in biochemistry.

The Breadth of Scope of the Claims

The claims have sufficient breadth of scope to encompass the generation of any mutation in any and all possible coding sequences as found in any life form, and in any level of heterogeneity. The method also encompasses the generation of new coding sequences where there are none and the production of "useful" polypeptides of unknown properties.

In view of the foregoing remarks, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, the specification has not been found to enable the claimed invention and as such, stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled by the instant specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

8. Claims 2, 6-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Pues et al.

Pues et al., disclose the generation of mutated nucleic acid sequences through a variation of inverse polymerase chain reaction (IPCR). The resultant mutated sequences are then introduced into a vector (in double stranded form) and expressed. Clones expressing a protein with the desired characteristic are selected.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley L. Sisson whose telephone number is (703) 308-3978. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W Gary Jones can be reached on (703) 308-1152. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3592 for regular communications and (703) 308-0294 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/214,645

Page 9

Art Unit: 1655

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


Bradley L. Sisson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1655

BLS

January 11, 2001